

A LETTER

TO THE

REV. T. T. CHURTON, M.A.

FELLOW AND

TUTOR OF BRASENOSÉ COLLEGE.

—◆—
“ If I build again the things which I have destroyed, I make myself a transgressor”.—Gal. ii. 18.

—◆—
OXFORD :

W. GRAHAM, HIGH-STREET.

J. G. F. AND J. RIVINGTON, LONDON.

1841.

THE HISTORY OF THE

REIGN OF

CHARLES THE FIRST

A LETTER,

&c. &c.

DEAR SIR,

YOU will doubtless have watched with much interest the proceedings in the University since the date of our letter addressed to the Editor of Tracts for the Times. You will have felt no small satisfaction that the Hebdomadal Board, on grounds substantially the same with those, on which we presumed to intrude our names upon that gentleman and the public, has disavowed any sanction on the part of the University of the Tract No. 90. You will also have seen the candid acknowledgment by Mr. Newman of his authorship of the Tract, made to the Vice-Chancellor.

But I now wish to draw your attention to the letter addressed by Mr. Newman to the Rev. Dr. Jelf. It is there stated, that the four gentlemen who signed the "protest" against his Tract No. 90, have misunderstood him in a very material point; namely, that, whereas they said the Tract suggests, that the Thirty-nine Articles do not contain any condemnation of the doctrines of purgatory, &c. as taught authoritatively by the Church of Rome, Mr. N., on the

contrary, does consider that they contain such ; he only says, that whereas they were written before the decrees of the Council of Trent, they were not directed against those decrees.—(Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 6.)

I am sure we did not think of pronouncing what the Author of the Tract himself did or did not consider the Articles to contain, further than as the Tract seemed to express an opinion. It is however further said, (Letter to Dr. Jelf) that the phrase in the Tract, “ the received doctrine of the day, and unhappily of this day too, or the doctrine of the Roman schools,” was intended to be equivalent to “ authoritative teaching”—pp. 9, 10.

You would, I know, much regret with me, that we should have misunderstood, and by consequence unintentionally have misrepresented, the meaning of the Author of the Tract ; but for my own satisfaction I have, since the appearance of the Letter to Dr. Jelf, reviewed the grounds, which we seemed to have on March 8th, for expressing ourselves as we did.

Unhappily, in so doing, these alternatives have been presented to me, either that we used our terms incautiously, or that, since we did not represent Mr. N.’s meaning, his language in the Tract was not sufficiently precise. That we felt a difficulty at the time from what we thought a want of definiteness, in many expressions in the Tract, and were aware, that if we stated the writer’s meaning to be, what it might be, or most probably was (to our apprehension) we might find afterwards that such was not

his real meaning, is doubtless very clearly recollected by us all.

But we thought, that the general reader would take as the undoubted meaning, that which appeared to us on the whole to be the meaning, and it was desirable for the sake of others, that it should be repudiated or avowed. At the risk of being tedious, it will be for our satisfaction to go over the grounds in detail, on which we decided as we did, which will oblige me to recite considerable passages of the Tract, §. 6. And, at the same time, I confess a desire to keep attention fixed upon the whole Tract for some while longer.

We judged that the Author designed in §. 6 to open subscription to the articles to persons holding opinions which might generally be thought to be incompatible with it, and that we judged rightly, see letter to Dr. Jelf, pp. 28-29. His argument in that section was founded on taking the word *Romish* in the Article as a distinctive word ; that the *Romish* doctrine of Purgatory, &c., was distinguished from other doctrine of Purgatory, &c. Of this reading of the words of the Article, something may be said below ; but if that were conceded him, then would be excluded, of course, from condemnation in the Article, all doctrines respecting Purgatory, &c. which could not be classed as *Romish*.

Now, though we doubted as to this reading of the Article, though in fact I have no doubt myself but that, on the contrary, "*Romish doctrine*" is the

general term, and Purgatory, &c. the special, it could not be conveniently insisted on, in the short paper we issued, which has since been called a protest. But, on the writer's own scheme, a distinction was forced upon us, as will be clearly seen, between the doctrines as taught by the Church of Rome, and the doctrines as popularly apprehended and received. The Tridentine doctrine, under its formal decrees, was excluded from the compass of the Article XXII., by his express memorandum that it was drawn up before the decree of the Council of Trent. This exclusion is really of no importance, because the decrees of that Council derive their full meaning from the teaching of the Roman Church, in and about the time when they were promulgated. However, we put that aside.* The Tridentine doctrine itself could not, in all its decrees, historically, be pointed at by the Article, and though the Tract intimated, on other than historical grounds, that the Article might be received on some points as well as the Tridentine decree, it was not worth while to advert to this.† Neither was it worth while to

* I cannot but wonder why this unimportant fact should be made, in the Tract itself, the ground of a distinction, from which nothing practical is drawn; and should furnish the whole cause of complaint against the four gentlemen.

† "The purgatory contemplated by the Homily was one in which our 'state would be changed'; (that this was not so will be seen afterwards). 'On the other hand, the Council of Trent, and Augustin and Cyprian, 'held purgatory to be a place for *believers* and not unbelievers. The 'Homily then, and therefore the article, does not speak of the Tridentine 'purgatory'—Tract, p. 26. 'The Council of Trent is obliged both to 'confess the above-mentioned enormities in a veneration of relics, and 'to forbid them'—p. 36. 'Here again the article gains a witness and 'concurrence from the Council of Trent', &c.—p. 40.

take any exception, from the fact of the convocation and statute of 1571, subsequent to the Council of Trent, being the authorities by which clerical subscription to the Articles is now enjoined ; although, if the Church of England should be thought to be any the more committed against the Romish errors, from its articles dating subsequently to the last Session at Trent, this circumstance deserves the most attentive consideration of those who now subscribe to them.

But to go on. The passage in the Tract which we seem to have misunderstood, is the following—"What is opposed is the *received doctrine* of the day, and unhappily of this day too, or the doctrines of the *Roman Schools*". No doubt, if this passage had stood alone, and had the statement made in it not been *exemplified*, we could have found no fault with it ; doctrines of the Roman schools seeming to be a phrase equivalent to Romish doctrine, because in the Articles of Edw. VI. the expression was, "The doctrine of the Schoolmen", &c. ; and the received doctrine might have meant the received teaching. The Article would then have been represented in the Tract as opposed, not to the Tridentine decrees themselves, but to the Romish system of doctrine and practice, which up to that time had been authoritatively taught, and was fastened upon the Roman Church by the decrees of Trent. This would have been intelligible and satisfactory ; whereas the mere exception, that the Articles could not point at the Council of Trent, unless it

meant, that they did not point at the teaching of the time recognised by that Council, appeared to be made to no end.*

But there was another passage in §. 9, apparently very deliberately penned, which appeared to confine the meaning of *received doctrine*, or *Romish doctrine*, to the actually existing practical corruptions then before the eyes of men.

“ Nothing can show more clearly than this passage, that the Articles are not written against the creed of the Roman Church, but against actual existing errors in it, whether taken into its system or not. Here the sacrifice of the *Mass* is not spoken of, in which the special question of doctrine would be introduced; but ‘the sacrifice’ (s) of *Masses*, certain observances, for the most part private and solitary, which the writers of the Articles saw before their eyes, and knew to have been in force in time past, and which involved certain opinions and a certain teaching. Accordingly the passage proceeds, ‘in which it *was commonly said*’; which surely is a strictly historical mode of speaking”.—*Tract*, p. 9.

Here the creed of the Roman Church could not mean the entire creed of the Roman Church; for no writer could possibly think of saying, that an Article, headed “Of the one oblation”, &c., was not directed against the entire creed of that Church, including the doctrine of the Trinity, with others which the Church

* In fact, nothing was done in the way of reformation at Trent—even the correction of ecclesiastical abuses, pretended to be made, became of no effect, from the reservation of the Pope’s dispensing power. Of the doctrines, &c., with which we are now concerned, the decree concerning the mass embodied the floating teaching that it was a sacrifice propitiatory for living and dead. As to Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, &c., they were all hurried over on the last two days of Session, Dec. 3-4, 1563, and left as they were.

of England, as well as of Rome, holds with the rest of Christendom : it must therefore mean the doctrine of the Romish Church on that point of the one oblation—namely, as to the sacrifices of masses. The Tract, therefore, would say, that not the creed of the Romish Church respecting the mass (which is what the four Tutors would mean by authoritative teaching as to the mass) is condemned in the Articles, but certain existing errors in that doctrine of the mass—namely, of (private) masses, and masses for money payments. “On the whole”, says the Tract, “it is conceived that the Article before us neither speaks against the mass in itself, nor against its being an offering for quick and dead for the remission of sin”.—p. 63.

In the above passage, the *creed of the Roman Church*, on special points, be it observed, is said *not* to be condemned in the Articles ; the “received doctrine”, equivalent to “authoritative teaching”, and “established creed”, (Letter, p. 6, 10,) is thought to be spoken against by the Thirty-nine Articles. What “all the best writers” say is “authoritative teaching”, and is censured by the Articles, (Letter, p. 12.) Also in page 15 of the Letter, “existing creed” is what the gentlemen who signed the protest call the “authoritative teaching”. Nothing however can be more unsatisfactory than the attempt to follow this writer through the shifting of his terms, both in the Letter and the Tract.

But as to the application of the principle advocated

in the Tract, it seemed to be this ; whatever the Article does not condemn it permits ; the tenets and practices it condemns will be pointed out chiefly by means of the comment which the Homilies afford ; whatever is found not to be therein condemned may be believed with subscription.*

We come, then, to—1. Purgatory.—Tract, p. 25. “ What the doctrine is which is reprobated, is plain, from the following passage in the Homilies”. Then follows the extract, in which occur these expressions—
“ Where is, then, the third place which they call purgatory ? or, where shall our prayers help and profit the dead ? S. Augustin doth only acknow-

* I say subscription from p. 4, Tract. “ Articles may be subscribed “ by those who aim at being Catholic in heart and doctrine”. Compare Letter, p. 25, after quotations from Bramhall, Laud, Hall, Taylor, Bull, and Stillingfleet, “ which go far beyond every thing he has said”. “ This view of the Articles, conveyed in these extracts, evidently allows of much “ greater freedom in the private opinion of individuals *subscribing them*, “ than I have contended for”. Here is a remarkable instance of the fallacy of quotations so frequent with this writer. His citations do not apply, they go to the granting a freedom in the private opinions of individuals, but not of *subscribers*. Bull is the only one who mentions subscription ; she (the Church) “ propounds them as a body of safe and pious principles, “ for the preservation of peace to be subscribed, and not openly contradicted, “ by her *sons*. And therefore she requires subscription to them only from “ the clergy and not from the laity”. Burnet makes the distinction very clearly, where our Author would confound. “ And therefore though they “ drew up a large form of doctrine, yet to all her *lay-sons* this is only a “ standard of Church Communion. The citations that are brought from “ those two great Primates, Laud and Bramhall, go no further than this “ —they do not seem to relate to *the clergy who subscribe them*, but to the “ laity and body of the people”. Intr. Exp. XXXIX Art.

If it be desired to open the question as to a latitude in clerical subscriptions to the Articles which are pointed against the Romish errors, let it be openly done, and argued upon the principles stated, p. 26, or any other ; but let not conclusions be intimated under authority of great names, which in fact make nothing for them.

ledge two places after this life, heaven and hell. As for the third place, he doth plainly deny that there is any such in all Scripture".—*Hom. concern. Prayer.*

Tract, p, 26.—“ Now it is plain, from this passage, that the Purgatory contemplated by the Homily, was one, for which no one will for an instant pretend to adduce even those Fathers who most favour Rome, *viz. one in which our state would be changed*, in which God’s sentence could be reversed. ‘The sentence of God’, says the writer, ‘is *unchangeable*, and cannot be revoked again ; there is no place for *repentance*’. On the other hand, the Council of Trent, and Augustin and Cyprian, so far as they express or imply any opinion approximating to that of the Council, *held Purgatory to be a place for believers, not unbelievers, not where men who have lived and died in God’s wrath, may gain pardon, but where those who have already been pardoned in this life, may be cleansed and purified for beholding the face of God*. The Homily, then, and therefore the Article, does not speak of the Tridentine Purgatory”.

“ The mention of Prayers for the dead in the above passage, affords an additional illustration of the limited and conditional sense of the terms of the Article now under consideration. For such prayers are obviously not condemned in it in the abstract, or in every shape, but *as offered to rescue the lost from eternal fire*”.—*Ib.*

The inference here intended in the Tract seemed to us undoubted, that one might remain untouched by the Article—believing, not only that men dying in a state of acceptance with God should be subjected to purgatorial pains hereafter, but that the prayers of others might alleviate their pains ; and in the face of a much more distinct statement than that quoted above as to the ‘received doctrine’, we should have been justified in saying, that the Tract ‘suggested’, that the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome as to

the doctrine of purgatory was not condemned in the Thirty-nine Articles.

Now see, in juxta-position, a quotation from Bull, (page 14, Letter to Dr. Jelf):—

“ This Article (the Tridentine) of purgatory after this life, *as it is understood and taught* by the Roman Church (*that is*, to be a place and state of misery and torment whereunto many faithful souls go presently after death, and there remain till they are thoroughly purged from their dross or delivered by prayers, indulgences, &c.) is contrary to Scripture and the sense of the Catholic Church for at least the first four centuries”, &c.

Now Mr. Newman conceives, (Letter, page 12,) that what all the best writers say is authoritative teaching, and a sufficient object for the censures conveyed in the Articles, though the decrees of Trent, taken in themselves, remain untouched. And yet he can make his quotation from Bull, as descriptive, on the authority of the teaching of the Roman Church, of a doctrine of purgatory, which, apart from any chronological exception,* would be reached by the spirit of the Article, and, say in the Tract; “ The Homily then, and therefore the Article, does not speak of the Tridentine purgatory”; “ the Homily (and therefore the Article) contemplates only a purgatory in which our state would be changed, so that they who have died in God’s wrath may gain pardon”; and therefore

* Not that the historical exception would avail here, for the Romish view of purgatory must have been well known at this time, since in Sess. Conc. Trident. VI. de Justificatione, the Canon quoted p. 11, was promulgated. This Session was held sixteen years before the Articles were drawn up, namely, Jan. 13th, 1547.

does not condemn the Romish purgatory of Bull, “a place where many faithful souls”, &c.

I confess myself surprised to see, that Mr. Newman, (Letter, p. 26), still seems to think, that the doctrine concerning purgatory condemned in the Article, and the doctrine held by Rome is, “that temporary punishment is a substitute for hell in the case of the unholy”. He quoted a small phrase from the Trent decree of purgatory in the Tract ; the important portions he seems to have overlooked :—

“ Quum catholica ecclesia.....docuerit, purgatorium esse, animasque ibi detentas fidelium suffragiis, potissimum vero acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari, præcipit sancta synodus episcopis, ut sanam de purgatorio doctrinam a sanctis Patribus et sacris conciliis traditam a Christi fidelibus crediCurent autem episcopi, ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, eleemosynæ, aliaque pietatis opera, quæ a fidelibus pro aliis *fidelibus defunctis fieri consueverunt*, fiant”.

In the sixth session of the Council, which was held January 13, 1547, De Justificatione, be it observed, sixteen years before the Articles were drawn up.

Canon XXX. is as follows :—

“ Si quis post acceptam justificationis gratiam cuilibet peccatori pœnitenti ita culpam remitti et reatum æternæ pœnæ deleri dixerit, ut nullus remaneat reatus pœnæ temporalis exsolvendæ vel in hoc sæculo, vel in futuro in purgatorio, antequam ad regna cœlorum aditus patere possit: anathema sit”.

Harding’s definition of purgatory :—

“ Quum nihil inquinati aditum habeat in cœlum, quidam autem vita excedant *quamvis homines isti Christiani et cœlestis*

regni hæredes non ita tamen penitus puri atque undique purgati, restat ut qui ejusmodi sunt post hanc vitam priusquam ad illum sempiternæ felicitatis locum perveniant, purgatione justâ defungantur". Quoting 2 Cor. vii. 1, he says—"Quis non hinc sequi videt, multis qui justificati sint, deesse tamen aliquid ad satisfactionem et sanctimoniam? qui si prius e rebus humanis auferantur quam legitimos omnes sanctitatis numeros expleverint, an non in eâ causâ sunt, ut post hinc vitam elui debeant ac perpurgari".—*Contra Juelli Apol.*

Upon this Jewell joins issue with him.

Nay, the conclusion on the whole of this must be, that Mr. Newman holds, that the Article does not condemn the doctrine of purgatory, as promulgated by the Tridentine decrees, expressing, as they do, the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome; or, if he prefers it, as taught by its best writers; upon his principle, I do not see why it might not be taught in our Lecture Rooms and from our pulpits.

After two quotations exemplifying the grievous extent to which the popular notions of purgatory might be carried, nothing further is added; and this is all on the subject of purgatory.

2. Pardons, or Indulgences.

Tract, p. 28.—"The history of the rise of the Reformation will interpret 'the Romish doctrine concerning pardons', without going further".

Then follows a passage from Bishop Taylor. The Authors cited, not only declare the enormous height to which the old doctrine was carried, but also the ill-foundation of the doctrine at all, that it originated in a gross misapplication of an authority given by the Council of Nice to the Bishops, to shorten the terms of penance inflicted by ecclesiastical censures.

“ They gave it high names, and called it a plenary remission, and the pardon of all sins : which the world was taught to look on as a thing of a much higher nature, than the bare excusing of men from discipline and penance. Purgatory was then got to be firmly believed, and all men were strangely possessed with the terror of it : so a deliverance from purgatory, and by consequence an immediate admission into heaven, was believed to be the certain effect of it”.—*Burnet*.

“ It would be considered what is meant by so many years of pardon, and so many years of true pardon. I know but of one natural interpretation of it ; and that it can mean nothing, but that some of the pardons are but fantastical, and not true ; and in this I find no fault, save only that it ought to have been said, that all of them are fantastical”.—*Taylor*.

The conclusion of the Tract-writer is subjoined in these words and no more—“The pardons then spoken of in the Article are *large* and reckless indulgences from the penalties of sin obtained on money payments”. That such should be the conclusion, we were naturally surprised ; but thinking that he had missed that, to which his quotations should have led him, if he considered them exponents of the Article, namely, that it condemns all indulgences from the penalties of sin (in penalties of sin, I do not include ecclesiastical censures) we did imagine him to hold, that this Article did not condemn the doctrine of indulgences as taught by the Romish Church, but only the corruption of that doctrine, which was perhaps never authoritatively taught, though practised with effrontery, the giving *large and reckless* indulgences upon money payments.

3. Veneration and worshipping of images and relics.

He says “ that the Homilies” (and the Homilies through this section of the Tract are taken as representing the Articles) “ do not altogether discard reverence towards relics has been shewn. Now let us

see what they do discard". But here I wish to draw your attention to the passage referred to, with the quotations from the Homilies.

Tract p. 23. "And a verification of such an understanding of the Article is afforded us in some sentences in the Homily on Peril of Idolatry, in which, as far as regards relics, a *certain* 'veneration' is sanctioned by its tone in speaking of them, though not of course the Romish veneration,

"The sentences referred to run as follows:—

"In the Tripartite Ecclesiastical History, the Ninth Book, and Forty-eighth Chapter, is testified, that 'Epiphanius, being yet alive, did work miracles: and that after his death, devils, *being expelled at his grave or tomb*, did roar'. Thus you see what authority St. Jerome (who has just been mentioned) and that most ancient history give unto the holy and learned Bishop Epiphanius".

Here the quotation in the Tract ends, but the Homily goes on.

"Thus you see what authority St. Jerome, and that most ancient history, give unto the holy and learned Bishop Epiphanius, whose judgment of images in churches and temples, then beginning by stealth to creep in, is worthy to be noted".

His judgment having been shewn in

"That when he entered into a certain church to pray, he found there a linen cloth hanging on the church door painted, and having in it the image of Christ as it were, or of some other saint; therefore when I did see the image of a man hanging in the Church of Christ, contrary to the authority of the Scriptures, I did tear it, and gave counsel to the keepers of the church that they should wind a poor man that was dead in the said cloth, and so bury him".—Hom. ib.

Again:—

"St. Ambrose, in his Treatise of the Death of Theodosius the Emperor, saith, 'Helena found the Cross, and the title on it. She worshipped the King, and not the wood, surely (for that is an heathenish error and the vanity of the wicked) but she worshipped Him that hanged on the Cross, and whose Name was written on the title', and so forth. See both the

godly empress's fact, and St. Ambrose's judgment at once; they thought it had been an heathenish error, and vanity of the wicked, *to have worshipped the Cross itself, which was embrued with our SAVIOUR CHRIST's own precious blood*".—*Peril of Idolatry*, part 2, *circ. init.*

"In these passages the writer does not positively commit himself to the miracles at Epiphanius's tomb, or the invention of the true Cross, but he evidently wishes the hearer to think he believes in both. This he would not do, if he thought all honour paid to relics wrong".—Tr. p. 24.

But if the latter passage is finished to the end of its paragraph, it stands thus:—

"They thought it had been an heathenish error to have worshipped the Cross itself, which was embrued with our Saviour Christ's own precious blood. And we fall down before every cross piece of timber, which is but an image of that cross". —Hom.

This is but an argument *a fortiori*, by no means shewing that the writer wished the hearer to think he believes in the invention of the true Cross, but—if they who thought they had found it would not worship even that, much less, &c. Neither does the Homilist at all concern himself as to his hearers believing in the miracle at Epiphanius's tomb. The miracles (he says) were believed of old, which shows in what great estimation he was held. And if he of so great estimation tore a cloth painted with an image &c. neither of the passages bear upon the question of relics, much less convey any judgment of the Homilist.

This is a very small matter in itself, that in extracting a quotation, a line or two of the succeeding context should have escaped the eye; but in this case these few lines would give a totally different

character to the passages taken, and to the thread of the argument of the writer. The inference from these citations was very material ; an inference which depends solely on the places, and which I do not believe could be derived from any other extracts from the Homilies, unless equally incomplete.

“ This he (the Homilist) would not do, if he thought all honour paid to relics wrong”.

“ If, then, in the judgment of the Homilies, not all doctrine concerning veneration of relics is condemned in the Article before us, but a certain toleration of them is compatible with its wording : neither is all doctrine concerning purgatory, pardons, images, and saints, condemned by the Article, but only ‘ the Romish’ ”.—Tr. p. 24.

From this example or partial induction in the case of relics he assumes his general proposition, the truth of which as applied to each particular he then proceeds boldly to verify. To return to p. 31. It has not then been already shewn that the Homilies do not altogether discard reverence towards relics. However, after quoting four close pages from the Homilies on the subject of image worship, the writer comes to this conclusion.

“ Now the veneration and worship condemned in these and other passages are such as these : kneeling before images, lighting candles to them, offering them incense, going on pilgrimage to them, hanging up crutches, &c. before them, lying tales about them, belief in miracles as if wrought by them through illusion of the devil, decking them up immodestly, and providing incentives by them to bad passions ; and, in like manner, merry music and minstrelsy, and licentious practices in honour of relics, counterfeit relics, multiplication

of them, absurd pretences about them. This is what the Article means by ‘the Romish doctrine’”.

As if there were *any* veneration or adoration permissible by the Article as interpreted by the Homilies. For my own part I am not inclined either to restrain or to expand the sense of the Articles, as men may think the Homilies expound them; nor do I recognise the Homilies as the sole or best interpreter of their sense, though they are most valuable historical documents, and contain a doctrine necessary for the times when they were composed. But Mr. N. undertook to make out his principles as applied to the XXII. and XXXI. Articles, chiefly by a reference to them as representing the sense of the Articles. “The Homily and therefore the Article”, p. 26. He rested his case on ground chosen by himself; his own ground even betrays him. For it would seem, if the question be decided by the Homilist, that he would deem even the having of images, if not Popish, unlawful.

“Wherefore the images of God, our Saviour Christ, the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Apostles, Martyrs, and others of notable holiness are, of all other images, most dangerous for the peril of idolatry, and therefore greatest heed to be taken that none of them be suffered to stand in Churches and Temples”.—Peril Idol. 3rd part.

And if there should be no images, neither, were there any, should there be any adoration of them; for, in a passage not quite correctly quoted in the Tract,

“What a fond thing is it for man, who hath life and

reason, to bow himself to a dead and insensible image, the work of his own hand. Is not this stooping and kneeling before them, *adoration of them*, which is forbidden so earnestly by God's word".

The words in italic are not in the passage as quoted in the Tract.

Upon this clause our impression was, that whereas the Article (as interpreted by the Homilies) would condemn all adoration and worshipping of images and relics, would consider as Romish all doctrine which taught such regard might be paid to them ; the writer of the Tract asserted or implied the contrary.

4. Invocation of Saints.

I think we all felt a degree of vexation, that the writer should draw the distinction made in the following passage. It is to be hoped that no one is so weak as to think, that the Articles condemn, as Romish invocation, poetical or rhetorical apostrophes ; nor, on the other, that saints might be lawfully invoked for their aid and intercession, because they might be apostrophised in figure of speech.*

" By ' invocation' here is not meant the mere circumstance of addressing beings out of sight, because we use the Psalms

* " They make the rhetorical flourishes and apostrophes of the Fathers, in their panegyrics of the Martyrs, to be solemn invocations of them. Now, what is there in all this, but what is usual in all authors, sacred and profane ? What is there more in this than in those apostrophes frequently found in the sacred writings, even to insensible creatures—' Hear, O Mountains, and give ear, O Earth'—' Praise the Lord, ye Dragons and all Deeps'—and who will infer from this that insensible creatures were thereby invoked and addressed unto ?"—*Discourse concerning the Invocation of Saints*, by S. Freeman, D.D. : 1684.

in our daily service, which are frequent in invocations of Angels to praise and bless God. In the Benedicite too we address ‘the spirits and souls of the righteous’, and in the Benedictus, St. John Baptist”.

“On the other hand, judging from the example set us in the Homilies themselves, invocations are not censurable, and certainly not ‘fond’, if we mean nothing definite by them, addressing them to beings which we *know* cannot hear, and using them as interjections. The Homilist seems to avail himself of this proviso in a passage, which will serve to begin our extracts in illustration of the *superstitious* use of invocations”.

An example set by the Homilist being the following :—

“We have left Him neither heaven, nor earth, nor water, nor country, nor city, peace nor war to rule and govern, neither men, nor beasts, nor their diseases to cure ; that a godly man might justly, for zealous indignation, cry out, *O heaven, O earth, and seas*, what madness and wickedness against God are men fallen into” !

After some passages from the Homilies, the text is taken up thus :—

“Whereas, then, it has been already shown, that not *all* * invocation is wrong (the only invocation as yet excepted is that of the apostrophe), this last passage plainly tells us *what kind* of invocation is not allowable, or what is meant by invocation in its exceptionable sense : viz., ‘a thing proper to God’, as being part of the ‘honour that is due and proper unto God’. And two instances are specially given of such calling and invoking, viz., *sacrificing* and *falling down in worship*. Besides this, the Homilist adds, that it is wrong to pray to them for ‘necessaries in this world’, and to accompany their services with ‘piping, singing, chanting, and playing’ on the organ, and of invoking saints as patrons of particular elements, countries, arts, or remedies”.

* Διὰ τὸ σύνεγγυς εἶναι τὴν ὁμωνυμίαν λανθάνει μᾶλλον.

Now, a part of one of the passages quoted is the following, which, at the risk of being tedious, I must transcribe :—

“ There are certain conditions most requisite to be found in every such a one that must be called upon, which if they be not found in Him unto whom we pray, then doth our prayer avail us nothing, but is altogether in vain.

“ The first is this, that He, to whom we make our prayers, be able to help us. The second is, that He will help us. The third is, that He be such a one as may hear our prayers. The fourth is, that he understand better than ourselves what we lack, and how far we have need of help. If these things be to be found in any other, saving only God, then may we lawfully call upon some other besides God. But what man is so gross, but he well understandeth that these things are only proper to Him who is omnipotent, and knoweth all things, even the very secrets of the heart ; that is to say, only and to God alone ? Whereof it followeth that we must call neither upon angel, nor yet upon saint, but only and solely upon God, as St. Paul doth write”.

In the following passage it will be observed, that if the Article coincide or is consistent, or so far as it is, with the decree of the Council of Trent, so far it does not condemn, in the judgment of the Tract, the Roman doctrine which was embodied in them :—

“ Here again, as before, the Article gains a witness and concurrence from the Council of Trent. ‘ Though’, say the divines there assembled, ‘ the Church has been accustomed sometimes to celebrate a few masses to the honour and remembrance of saints, yet she *doth not teach that sacrifice is offered to them*, but to GOD alone, who crowned them ; wherefore neither is the priest wont to say, *I offer sacrifice to thee, O Peter, or O Paul*, but to God”. (Sess. 22.)

If the passage means, that the celebrating masses to the honour of saints is not condemned in the Article, the Article does not so far condemn the Romish doctrine of invocation of saints.

After quoting a passage from Bishop Andrews, in which he seems to consider the practical teaching of the Romish Church in its formularies to be of direct, absolute, and final prayer to saints, and that if it were indirect or “*prier pour prier*”, it would not be unlawful, “Bellarmine’s admissions quite bear out the principles laid down by Bishop Andrews and the Homilies”—but certainly the Homilies never laid down such as the following :—

“Secondly, from the usage of the Church ; for in the mass-prayers, and the saints’ offices, we never ask any thing else, but that, at their prayers, benefits may be granted to us by God. Thirdly, from reason : for *what we need surpasses the powers of the creature*, and therefore even of saints ; therefore we ought to ask nothing of saints, beyond their impetrating from God what is profitable for us. Fourthly, from Augustine and Theodoret, who expressly teach that saints are not to be invoked *as gods*, but as able to gain from God *what they wish*. However, it must be observed, when we say, that nothing should be asked of saints but their prayers for us, the question is not about the words, but the *sense* of the words. For, as far as words go, *it is lawful* to say : ‘St. Peter, pity me, save me, open for me the gate of heaven’ ; also, ‘give me health of body, patience, fortitude’, &c., provided that we mean ‘save and pity me *by praying for me*’ ; ‘grant me this or that *by thy prayers and merits*’. For so speaks Gregory Nazianzen, and many others of the ancients, &c’.—*De Sanc. Beat.* i. 17.

Now, if the Author holds, that the Article does not condemn prayer to the saints for their intercession ; in the judgment of the Homily, to which the Tract appeals, as showing the sense of the Articles, such prayer is unlawful and heathenish.

“For it is evident, that our image-maintainers have the same opinion of saints which the Gentiles had of their false gods, and thereby are moved to make them images, as the Gentiles did. If answer be made, that they make saints but intercessors to God, and means for such things as they would obtain of God ; that is, even after the Gentiles’ idolatrous usage, to make them of saints, gods, called *Dii Medioximi*,

to be mean intercessors and helpers to God, as though he did not hear, or should be weary if he did all alone. So did the Gentiles teach, that there was one chief power working by other, as means; and so they made all gods subject to fate or destiny; as Lucian in his Dialogues feigneth, that Neptune made suit to Mercury, that he might speak with Jupiter. And therefore in this also, it is most evident, that our image-maintainers be all one in opinion with the Gentiles idolaters. —*Against Peril of Idolatry, part 3.*

But how could we conclude otherwise, from the expression of the Tract, than that it was thought the Article did not convey a condemnation of the Romish doctrine of invocation of saints, but only of the corruption and abuse of it?

5. Of the Sacrifice of the Mass.

“Here the sacrifice of the mass is not spoken of, but ‘the sacrifice(s) of masses, certain observances, for the most part private and solitary’.—*Tract*, p. 59.

“On the whole, then, it is conceived that the Article before us, neither speaks against the mass in itself, nor against its being an offering for the quick and dead for the remission of sins’.—p. 63.

The Tract, very evidently, here draws a distinction between the doctrine of Rome, and the error in it; maintains that the doctrine of the mass is not condemned by the Article, that solitary and venal masses are. But this distinction was not allowed by the Romanists themselves, in the age when the Articles were composed.

Henry VIII.’s Answer to the German Ambassadors :—

“Nam si ideo missæ privatæ abolendæ sunt in totum, quia de illis Thomas Aquinas, Gabriel, atque alii doctrinas *ut*

dicitis impias induxerunt, viz. missas ex opere operato gratiam mereri, et tollere peccata vivorum et mortuorum, et applicari posse alienum opus ad alterum, quicquid sit, quod illi asserunt, hoc de omni missa asserunt, non de privata duntaxat; qua propter si ad tollendas illas opiniones qualescunque missa privata esset abroganda, eadem ratione abroganda esset synaxis et missa publica".—*Burnet's Hist. Ref. Addenda, vol. I., sec. vii.*

The Germans had said :—

"Ex quibus omnibus sequitur *missam* non esse sacrificium, quod ex opere operato mereatur, facienti vel aliis remissionem peccatorum, ut illi (scholastici) docuerunt. Et quocunque quidam fuco nitantur excusare missas privatas, semper eis refragatur et reclamat doctrina ipsorum de missa, qua eam aliis posse adplicari tradiderunt, et peccata delere hominibus persuaserunt".—*Ib. sec. vi.* The date is 1538.

So also Harding and Jewell. Harding would not overstate the Romish doctrine. Anno 1563.

"Hoc autem respectu, minimè dubitamus, quin hoc sacrosanctum missæ sacrificium valeat, efficaxque sit ex opere operato, non quemadmodum Juellus interpretatur, quia missa dicitur, et fit, in quo opus operatum ad ipsam sacerdotis actionem refert : minimè sic : sed propter ipsum opus, quod Deus ipse operatur.....Quod corpus atque sanguis, quando, juxta ejus mandatum Deo offertur.....Gratissimum illi est sacrificium, pro vivis simul *et mortuis*, si nullum is, qui sumit, obicem posuerit. *Mortuos intelligo eos solummodo*, qui per fidem se redemptionis per Christum acquisitæ commendarunt, perque hanc fidem a Deo meruerunt, ut *postquam hinc migrarint*, quemadmodum Augustinus ait, *hoc illis sacrificium prodesse posset*".—*Quæst. xx., sec. 1.*

Then see Jewell :

"Vel felicitatem, vel peccatorum remissionem, quæ est interna sancti spiritus actio, externo cuiquam officio acceptam referre, erroris cujusdam est superstitiosi, inepti, Judaici....

.... De sacrorum autem mysteriorum usu ac ratione Christus non dixit, *Hoc facite in remissionem peccatorum* : sed, *Hoc facite in meam commemorationem*. Unicum pro peccato perpetuumque sacrificium est ipse Dei filius crucis supplicio affectus : qui nunc in carnis nostræ natura, atque substantia patri suo ad dexteram assidet, et pro nobis in æternum interpellat, estque illud unicum pro peccatis nostris sacrificium, et propitiatio. Quæcunque est huic doctrinæ contraria doctrina, ea impia et blasphema est".—*Ib. sec. 3.*

I do not wish to add more on this particular head ; but, on the whole, we were forced to the conclusion, that the Author held, that many doctrines, which we thought Romish, which turn out to be so, were not expressly excluded by the Thirty-nine Articles. Nor can I now see how the "vagueness" in some parts of the Tract, which gave us this impression, "arose from the doctrines of the Articles being sometimes brought out only so far as the Homilies explained them"—(Letter to Dr. Jelf, postscript)—because, from the citations made in this Letter, one thing will be obvious enough, that the Author's conclusions are brought out much beyond any legitimate inference from his quotations.

Whereas the Homilist holds with S. Augustin, that "there be only two states hereafter, heaven and hell", the Tract thinks the Article would not condemn the opinion that, there is a third place, wherein prayers may benefit those who there abide. In another place of the Homily not quoted, "Let these and such other places be sufficient to take away the gross error of purgatory out of our heads, neither let us dream any more, that the souls of the dead are any thing *at all*

holpen by our prayers".—*Hom. conc. Prayer*.—Whereas Jer. Taylor, who is quoted to illustrate the Article on the point of pardons, "thinketh all of them to be fantastical"; the Tract considers the Article to "speak only of large and reckless indulgences, obtained on money payments.

While the Homilist, a good interpreter here, says generally, that "adoration of images is earnestly forbidden by the Word of God", and nothing whatever even indirectly in favour of honour paid to relics; the Tract thinks only *certain* veneration and worship of images to be condemned.

The Homilist; that we must "call neither upon angel nor upon saint, but only and solely upon God"; the Tract-writer thinks, that what Bellarmin will concede on the one hand, may be admitted by the Article on the other, "That we may ask of saints their supplicating from God what is profitable for us".

Little have the Divines of our Church dreamt, either that the Articles were not "full against Popery", or that any doctrine of purgatory, invocation of saints, &c., could be other than Popish. If the origin of some of these doctrines ran up towards the primitive times, they would only see in this an early "working of the mystery of iniquity". They would rather, if there were any connexion between the two, surrender that which was primitive, than, in regard to the primitive, look tenderly on that which was Popish.*

* Primitive, that is in a certain sense. In its highest sense the Primitive

I have at hand Bishop Stratford :—

“ I need not show, that the doctrine of purgatory, as taught by the Church of Rome, cannot derive its pedigree from the Scriptures or the primitive Fathers, because it is freely confessed by many of her own members, that it hath no foundation in either of them. The doctrine of indulgences is another new article of the Roman creed—Cardinal Caietan grants that no sacred Scripture, no authority of the ancient Doctors, Greek or Latin, hath brought the original of them to our knowledge. Another corruption is the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass. The Church of England not only grants, but asserts, that the Eucharist is a commemorative and representative sacrifice ; but this will not satisfy the present Church of Rome, and therefore our Church hath deservedly condemned the sacrifice of masses as blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits. Another gross corruption in the worship of Rome, which rendered the Reformation necessary, was the worship of images. This the Church of England has condemned as idolatrous, and proved it to be so by the authority of God’s Holy Word, and by the testimonies of the ancient Fathers. Add to this their solemn prayers to saints departed. The distinctions of worship into supreme and subordinate, absolute and relative, terminative and transient, as they have no foundation in Scripture, so the Christians of the first ages were ignorant of them, they having no such different objects of religious worship to which these different degrees were to be suited”.—*Discourse of the necessity of Reformation.*

Let me now cordially congratulate you, as in-

is the spring time of the Catholic ; but there is a lower sense, such as when an opinion begins to shew itself in one or two respectable Fathers. “ Agreeably, we say that the Sacraments do not profit the living without faith, much less the dead ; for as to what they pretend concerning their purgatories, *though that is no very late invention*, yet it is nothing but a silly old wives’ story. St. Augustin sometimes saith there is such a place ; sometimes he doth not deny but there may be such a place ; sometimes he doubts if there be ; and at other times he positively denies there is any such place at all ; and thinks that men out of human kindness to the dead are deceived on that point”.—*Jewell’s Apology.*

terested with the rest of us in the well being of our Church and people, on the events here of the last few days. We may well be thankful, that the attention of a writer, who for some time past has been thought to exercise a considerable influence in the formation of clerical and Church opinion, should have been drawn forcibly, but not I trust rudely, to the possible tendency of some of his opinions, and of his method of putting them forth. We may well be glad for the sake of numbers at a distance from this place, some of whom might not perceive that the Tract contained any thing strange ; some might consider the Author already a Romanist ; others be utterly bewildered as to its meaning ; that the Letter to Dr. Jelf has appeared, from which certain of the writer's views may with a degree of distinctness be gathered.*

For to say nothing else, it is most desirable, that one who acknowledges himself to be opposed to the "traditionary" "modern" interpretation of the formularies of our Church,† should place himself in a distinct position. I do not think, that the opinions he advocates will, in consequence, gain fewer adherents than otherwise, but they will be expressed with more definiteness and precision, than is usually met with in fugitive and anonymous Tracts : and wherever they

* I cannot say that, on the whole, this Letter is much more satisfactory to me than the Tract. There is found in it the same ambiguity of terms—the same shifting of terms—the same inapplicability of quotations to that which they are to prove ;—yet there are some views of the writer's brought forward distinctly.

† Letter to Dr. Jelf, p. 18.

may be thought to be erroneous, or of an ill tendency, those, who are competent to discuss them, will not avoid the controversy, from a dislike to enter the lists with an opponent who has no bearing on his shield.

We have been accustomed now, for many generations, to consider the Articles exponents of the Catholic faith. Should there really have been formed any deliberate design of referring the interpretation of them back again to Catholic and primitive tests, (and who is to collect, and who is to decide upon the suffrages of antiquity,) it will be necessary for those who have more leisure, and are better qualified than myself, to vindicate the existing position, in respect of her Articles at least, of the Anglican Church. I must indeed confess a suspicion, that from the struggle of close and legitimate controversy the maintainers of this vague Catholicity will shrink. If one may judge from partial examples, they have not formed the necessary habits of accuracy in definition, in division, in inference, in method, in citation.

But there will not be wanting men to show the true character of our Church; that she has her strength in a legitimate formal constitution; whereby she is an authorized channel of grace in the sacraments; while in fact her teaching is so Scriptural, that she almost discourages the holding, as matter even of opinion, on religious subjects, that which may not be proved by the Word of God. While she recognizes, as in fact she must, if she would teach a reasonable faith and service, that the ultimate appeal

as to the interpretations of Scripture will, from the constitution of man, be to the reason and spirit of the individual ; she would lead her children, and instruct them, but they must finally, with the aids she gives, judge for themselves ; they must “ search the Scriptures, whether these things be so”. She would have her disciples say, “ Now we believe, not because of thy saying, but we have seen Him ourselves, and know that this is indeed the Christ the Saviour of the world”. And I know not where scope may be found for the “ feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, and devotedness”, when they struggle for utterance in the breast of the spiritual man, more freely than in our communion. Where our sons are taught without adding thereto, or diminishing aught from it, the “ great mystery of Godliness ; God manifest in the flesh, justified in the Spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory”.

But if without any theory or scheme of reconstructing our Church according to some ideal primitive model, amiable and benevolent men might desire by a relaxation of certain articles to comprehend some who might otherwise wander from our communion in the direction of Rome ; surely there are other “ arrows within the quiver” of a well-furnished theologian, other arts of a “ fisher of men”, for the saving of such souls. The fact of any hesitating between the Roman and Anglican communion, because men feel “ led” to doctrines and practices, which at least lie

on the very verge of the Popish system, might rather induce a suspicion that they have already gone somewhat too far ; that there has been something unsound in their previous teaching and institution. It is a good maxim, a necessary one, that no dogma may be believed, which is contrary to Scripture. It is a safer practical one, to reckon, that none, which may not be proved by it, is of much worth in the Christian's belief, possibly injurious to its purity ; he had better be taught to suspend his judgment on such points, than endeavour where scripture is silent, to decide them by some other authority. And schemes of comprehension, of necessity defeat their own design ; if weak brethren are included on the one hand, weak brethren will take offence on the other.

In conclusion, I would seriously beg the attention of those who, in an amiable, a pious affection for that which is ancient, would gladly see some practices called primitive restored among us, which the wisdom of the Church of England (which is to us the channel of grace and salvation) has thought fit to dispense with or disallow—I would beg their attention to the following passage concerning the setting up of images in Churches, and that they would generalize the warning conveyed in it :—

“ And thus you see how, from having of images privately, it came to public setting of them up in churches and temples, although without harm at the first, as was then of some wise and learned men judged : and from simply having them there, it came at the last to worshipping of them. So that I conclude, as it may be possible in *some one city or little*

country to have images set up in temples and churches, and yet idolatry, by earnest and continual preaching of God's true Word, and the sincere Gospel of our Saviour Christ, may be kept away for a short time : so it is impossible that (images once set up and suffered in temples and churches) any great countries, much less the whole world, can any long time be kept from idolatry. And the godly will respect, not only their own city, country, and time, and the health of men of their age, but be careful for all places and times, and the salvation of men of all ages. *At the least they will not lay such stumbling blocks and snares for the feet of other countrymen and ages, which experience hath already proved to have been the ruin of the world.—Against Peril of Idolatry ; 3rd part.*

I am, dear Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

H. B. WILSON.

St. John's College, March 26, 1841.

MEMORANDUM

1. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a summary of the information received from the various sources regarding the activities of the [redacted] during the period [redacted] to [redacted].

2. The information was obtained from [redacted] and [redacted] who have provided reliable information in the past.

3. The [redacted] has been observed to be active in the [redacted] area and has been seen to be in contact with [redacted] and [redacted].

4. It is believed that the [redacted] is currently engaged in [redacted] activities and is likely to continue to do so in the future.

5. The [redacted] is considered to be a potential threat to the [redacted] and should be kept under close surveillance.

6. It is recommended that the [redacted] be kept under close surveillance and that any further information be reported to the [redacted] immediately.

7. The [redacted] is considered to be a potential threat to the [redacted] and should be kept under close surveillance.

8. It is recommended that the [redacted] be kept under close surveillance and that any further information be reported to the [redacted] immediately.

9. The [redacted] is considered to be a potential threat to the [redacted] and should be kept under close surveillance.

10. It is recommended that the [redacted] be kept under close surveillance and that any further information be reported to the [redacted] immediately.

ADDENDUM.

MR. NEWMAN quotes Archbishop Laud, in his Letter to Dr. Jelf, with a design of inferring, that principles of allowing great diversity of doctrine with subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles were entertained by that Prelate. I am very glad that my attention should have been drawn by one of the public Journals to the History and Writings of one Davenport, otherwise Franciscus a Sancta Clara, to whom the subjoined notice refers; from which it will appear that the Archbishop was not a man to surrender the pure doctrine of the Church of England, or the independence of its Constitution.

The extracts which follow from the writings of Sancta Clara, and which I regret time does not permit me to carry to a greater length, will shew, in juxta-position with some passages in Tract No. 90, that we may well regard its principles with suspicion, when they so resemble the propositions of such a propagandist as Davenport.

“CHRISTOPHER DAVENPORT, a very learned Englishman, was born at Coventry, in Warwickshire, about the year 1598, and educated in grammar learning at a school in that city. He was sent to Merton College, in Oxford, at fifteen years of age; where spending two years, he, upon an invitation from some Romish priest living in or near Oxford, afterwards went to Doway. He remained there for some time; and, then going to Ypres, he entered into the order of Franciscans among the Dutch there, upon the 7th of October, 1617. After several removals from place to place, he became a missionary into

England, where he went by the name of Franciscus a Sancta Clara; and at length was made one of the chaplains to Henrietta Maria, the royal consort of King Charles I. Here he did all he could to promote the cause of popery, by gaining disciples, raising money among the English Catholics to carry on public matters abroad, and by writing books for the advancement of his religion and order. He was very eminent for his uncommon learning, being excellently versed in school divinity, in fathers and councils, in philosophers, and in ecclesiastical and profane histories. He was, Mr. Wood tells us, a person of very free discourse, while his fellow-labourer in the same vineyard, Hugh Cressy, was reserved; of a lively and quick aspect, while Cressy was clouded and melancholy: all which accomplishments made him agreeable to protestants as well as papists. Archbishop Laud, it seems, had some knowledge of this person; for, in the seventh article of his impeachment, it is said, that ‘the said Archbishop, for the advancement of popery and superstition within this realm, hath wittingly and willingly received, harboured, and relieved divers popish priests and Jesuits, namely, one called Sancta Clara, alias Davenport, a dangerous person and Franciscan friar, who hath written a popish and seditious book, entitled, *Deus, natura, gratia, &c.* wherein the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, established by Act of Parliament, are much traduced and scandalized: that the said Archbishop had divers conferences with him, while he was writing the said book’, &c. To which article, the Archbishop made this answer:—‘I never saw that Franciscan friar, Sancta Clara, in my life, to the utmost of my memory, above four times, or five at most. He was first brought to me by Dr. Lindsell: but I did fear, that he would never expound the Articles so, that the Church of England might have cause to thank him for it. He never came to me after, till he was almost ready to print another book, to prove, that episcopacy was authorized in the Church by divine right; and this was, after these unhappy stirs began. His desire was, to have this book printed here; but at his several addresses to me for this, I still gave him this answer: That I did not like the way which the Church of Rome went concern-

ing episcopacy; that I would never consent, that any such book from the pen of a Romanist should be printed here; that the Bishops of England are very well able to defend their own cause and calling, without any help from Rome, and would do so when they saw cause: and this is all the conference I ever had with him'.

"He was the author of several works:—He wrote, 1. *Paraphrastica expositio articulorum confessionis Anglicæ*. 2. *Deus, natura, gratia: sive, tractatus de prædestinatione, de meritis, &c.*"

SANCTA CLARA, Problem.

37, de Invoc. Sanct.

"Verba in frontispicio sine dubio durissima. Attendendum tamen, quod vi hujus articuli non reprehenditur Invocatio Sanctorum simpliciter seu in se: ut patet: *sed Romana doctrina de Invocatione*, seu de explicatione invocationis Sanctorum: sic etiam diserte astruitur: ut etiam patet".

id. ib.

"Eodem plane modo et eodem verborum tenore, in eodem articulo, abjiciunt, non Purgatorium, indulgentias, adorationem imaginum et reliquiarum in se, sed ut prius DOCTRINAM ROMANAM de his omnibus, id est, doctrinam

TRACT FOR TIMES,

§ 6, p. 23.

"Now the first remark that occurs on perusing this Article is, that the doctrine objected to is 'the *Romish* doctrine'".

id. ib. p. 25.

"If, then, the doctrine condemned in this Article concerning purgatory, pardons, images, relics, and saints, be not the Primitive doctrine, nor the Catholic doctrine, nor the Tridentine doctrine, but the *Romish, doctrina Romanen-*

falsò nobis imputatam. De Purgatorio putant esse locum à nostris inventum ad cacabum Pontificis concoquendum (est phrasis Calvinistarum) ad crucem Christi evacuandam, &c. mira hujusmodi clamitant. De Indulgentiis, putant illas Pontificis venales nundinas, quasi pro libito suo viatores, vel defunctos ab omni pœnarum debito exsolvere (intelligo semper de Calvinistis). De cultu imaginum et reliquiarum, putant nos latrām proprie dictam ipsis terminative tribuere, Gentium idola constituere. Has impias impiorum hominum calumnias et fabellas, sub nomine DOCTRINÆ ROMANÆ, ut ridiculas abjiciunt, nos ut Dei sponsæ summe injuriosas abhorremus. Purgatorium vero in se, seu quo ad substantiam definitionis Ecclesiæ, præsertim in Florentino, plurimi admittunt, id est, *locum purgationis et emundationis*, ut loquitur Cyprianus tom. 1. ep. 52, (licet modus purgandi et emundandi non adeo perspicue definitur”).

id. Paraph. Art. xxxi.

“Totus hic Articulus durissimus videtur; rectius tamen introspeciendo, non adeo veritati discordem judicem

sium, let us next consider *what* in matter of fact it is”.

id. § 9, p. 63.

“On the whole, then, it is conceived that the Article before us neither speaks against the Mass in itself, nor against

...In verbis posterioribus, si sobriè intelligantur, nihil agitur contra Sacrificia Missæ in se, sed contra vulgarem vel vulgatam opinionem de ipsis, scilicet quod Sacerdotes in Sacrificiis offerrent Christum pro vivis et defunctis, in remissionem pœnæ et culpæ, adeò ut virtute hujus Sacrificii ab eis oblatis independenter à Crucis Sacrificio, mereantur populo remissionem, &c. Hæc est vulgata opinio, quam hic perstringit Articulus”.

its being an offering for the quick and the dead for the remission of sin ; but against its being viewed, on the one hand, as independent of or distinct from the Sacrifice on the Cross, which is blasphemy, and, on the other, its being directed to the emolument of those to whom it pertains to celebrate it, which is imposture in addition”.

